

September 27, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

24309

Albert S. Nemir, representing Brazilian Sugar and Alcohol Institute, was to get a minimum fee of \$35,100 per year for 1962 and 1963. The agreement also provided a commission of 25 cents per metric ton of Brazilian sugar effectively shipped from Brazil to the U.S. consumers market. The compensation agreement filed with Justice Department said:

The commission referred to in the present clause, plus the minimum fee for 1 year as established under clause 2, cannot under any condition exceed yearly the sum of \$95,200.

A memo filed March 9, 1963, indicated the agreement covered a period to December 31, 1963, and provided a minimum fee of \$25,000 a year. No fee income has been reported since December 31, 1962.

The most recent income reported was \$31,511.06 received December 31, 1962. This was for the 6-month period which ended March 9, 1963.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. FEIGHAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

JUAN BOSCH'S DEMAND FOR U.S. DAMAGES IS ARROGANT

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida (at the request of Mr. VIGORITO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, former Dominican President Juan Bosch's demand that the United States pay \$1 billion in damages for its role in preventing the Red takeover of Santo Domingo is arrogant.

This demand is nothing but an attempt to boost Bosch. While other Dominicans are trying to be constructive in their country, Bosch is adding to chaos by acting in his own self-interest. If he is such a Dominican patriot why did he wait until the shooting stopped to return to his country.

A total of over \$15 million in U.S. aid was extended to the Dominican Republic last year.

That country still owes us over \$100 million in loans. While they are being repaid according to schedule, Bosch is doing little to further cooperation between the United States and the Dominican Republic.

RETIREMENT OF DR. LUTHER L. TERRY

(Mr. JONES of Alabama (at the request of Mr. VIGORITO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute today to an eminent Alabamian, who has achieved a remarkable and enviable record in the field of health and medicine. I refer to Dr. Luther L. Terry, who retires as Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service on September 30.

Dr. Terry leaves his post to take up new duties as vice president in charge of medical affairs of the University of Pennsylvania, where he will continue to contribute effectively to the strength and skills of the medical profession. He will administer the affairs of the schools of medicine, dental medicine, veterinary medicine, nursing, and allied professions as well as the activities of the university hospital and the graduate hospital. Each year he will be responsible for the professional training of some 2,000 men and women.

In recent years, Mr. Speaker, the Congress has recognized through legislation the critical need for expanded training opportunities in the medical profession. It is indeed gratifying to know that a leader of the caliber of Dr. Terry is enlisting in this tremendously vital drive to bring the American people improved and advanced medical services.

Dr. Terry is a native of Red Level, Ala., where his father was a general practitioner of medicine. Much of his earlier instruction in medicine and medical training was received in Alabama schools and hospitals. Alabama is justifiably proud of this.

Dr. Terry made his mark at the National Institutes of Health where after 8 years of distinguished service he was named Assistant Director of the National Heart Institute. President Kennedy appointed him Surgeon General in 1961.

I have worked with Dr. Terry on legislation but more importantly I know him as a friend. He has given much to the medical profession, to his State, and to his Nation.

He has been a dedicated and conscientious public servant, Mr. Speaker, and the Public Health Service will miss his leadership.

But knowing the man, I know he will continue to serve his country and his profession. I salute Dr. Terry and wish him Godspeed.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ANTI-POVERTY PROGRAM

(Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. VIGORITO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important achievements of this Congress, in my humble opinion, was the passage of the antipoverty legislation. The commitment of this administration to fight to end poverty in our midst—a new idea in organized government—was met, as are all new ideas, with controversy, and criticism. Criticism of the program is oftentimes based upon a complete ignorance of the concept of poverty.

When I was a small boy in a coal mining camp, many of our citizens considered poverty a way of life and not a blight upon the body politic or a serious concern of the Nation as it really was and is now. It is refreshing, therefore, to read a series of articles not specifically an out and out endorsement of the program as it is in being, but at least an analysis to be absorbed in the evaluation the articles undertake.

Petty political bickering and expansive

publicity that appeared early in the administration of the program have acted as a deterrent in getting it on its way to achieving the goals intended.

I believe every Member of Congress should read these articles from the National Observer, a national newspaper covering the subject not on a local or regional basis, but from a view of national impact. These articles should be read so that blind criticism may be tempered with a better understanding of the problems involved.

I myself have been critical of some of the specifics in the administration, particularly under Head Start where we are attempting to teach fundamental language, reading, and writing in a vast area of need. This criticism, however, is only because of my impatience as well as that of many others to get on with the job and to get the program in full swing, and is not aimed at the persons charged with the responsibility of administration.

I pray that Members will read these articles and then take a firm look at the antipoverty war and take a little pride in the knowledge that they have been a part of the first drive made in human history to relegate poverty as such to the dark days of the past, a part of the drive to move forward with hope and desire to eliminate want and need so that ignorance and hunger may no longer be a part of the American scene.

Mr. Speaker, the articles from the National Observer follow:

[From the National Observer, Aug. 16, 1965]
LEARNING ABOUT SLUM LIFE: EYE-OPENING TRAINING FOR VISTA'S VOLUNTEERS

BALTIMORE.—“A bunch of us went downtown to a movie. We saw people nicely dressed; and, in a way, it was a nice feeling to be back with this kind of people. But then, after the movie, here we were walking down Pratt Street back to the slum. It made us realize how blind we were in the past—bypassing everything by taking the expressway back to the suburbs.”

These comments come from 20-year-old Wayne Dorris of Boston, who recently graduated from an intensive 6-week training course conducted here by the University of Maryland School of Social Work. Mr. Dorris and his 26 fellowgraduates are now at work in a variety of assignments: Employment counseling in Atlanta, youth work in Detroit, legal counseling in San Francisco, or neighborhood-center work in Durham, N.C. They are among the more than 1,000 VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) volunteers now in the field as part of the Office of Economic Opportunity's war on poverty.

All of the VISTA volunteers have received instruction at one of 20 training centers over the country. The Baltimore center was one of the first established and has influenced the pattern of the other centers, which are aimed at preparing volunteers to face the problems of urban poverty.

THE MOST LASTING LESSON

Mr. Dorris' recognition that his eyes were previously closed to the poverty around him is perhaps the most lasting lesson the volunteers can be taught at these centers. “We are dealing with middle-class people coming out of the middle-class background,” says Ernest M. Kahn, the 39-year-old social worker who heads the training center. “They must face the question: ‘How do I really feel when I get involved with the dirt and grime of poverty?’”

Adds Mrs. Patricia M. Keith, assistant director: “A good part of the purpose of the assignments is to get the trainees used to

observing and seeing. We are trying to help them learn how to see what's happening around them."

The assignments Mrs. Keith alludes to include fieldwork 3 days a week in which the trainees are placed with a number of social or welfare agencies to work on actual cases under direction of agency staff members. The assignment might be to a boys' club, city hospital, family and children's society office, or neighborhood community center.

OBSERVE, TALK, AND REPORT

Then there are the weekly observation assignments in which the trainees in small groups take the bus to places where they can learn how the poor live—public-housing projects, public markets, health clinics, pool halls, or flophouses. The trainees are asked to observe and talk to people and write a report on what they have seen.

"We want these people to develop some ability and some skill at visiting with the poor," says Mr. Kahn. "They get so they're not shocked at the stench of urine, for example. And they begin to deal with these people as people; after a while they are able to offer some specific help. Often, they have the time to do things that the harassed regular social worker for the agency just doesn't have time to do."

Mr. Kahn cites the case of a girl assigned to Hopkins Hospital, who was told to follow up a case of a mother who failed to give her child medicine prescribed by the hospital. The trainee found that the mother wasn't following instructions because she didn't know how to tell time. In half an hour the trainee was able to teach her and straighten out the problem.

The training program also includes lectures by social work professors and welfare-agency executives on various aspects of the poverty problem: Mental health and poverty, family life in the slums, health services for the poor, and the like. There are also Saturday morning workshops at which specific skills are taught, such as tutoring, home-making, group leadership, community organization, folk dancing, and creative arts. Each week in three 2-hour seminars, led by experienced social workers, the trainees discuss questions raised in their fieldwork, observation, and lecture assignments, and also talk about their own attitudes about poverty and the training program.

These sessions not only enable the volunteers to crystallize their impressions, but allow VISTA officials to evaluate the volunteers preparatory to the inevitable screening-out process, which includes several interviews with a clinical psychologist. Out of the 34 candidates who started this particular 6-week cycle, 4 were dropped and 3 others quit. The final decision on dropping a volunteer is made by a six-man board of three training-center staff members and three VISTA staffers from Washington. The sessions also help the volunteers gain an insight into their own motives for joining VISTA.

Says Oscar Carter, the training placement officer: "For one thing, they're getting away from parental domination. For a lot of them it's their first time away from home on their own. Secondly, there's an altruistic motive; they want to help people less fortunate than themselves. And there are quite a few who are trying to determine their professional direction. They are using this as a practical test of whether they want to work for a public service agency."

A CLEAN SHEET OVER THE BEDBUGS

"I haven't been as excited about anything in my life," says Ann Weinhold, 22, of Ithaca, N.Y. Miss Weinhold describes one 3-week effort to clean up a three-story house where an 81-year-old woman, crippled by arthritis, and her 69-year-old diabetic husband lived.

"There were ratholes in the kitchen. And

when we came to change the bed linen, there were literally thousands of bedbugs crawling on the beds. To get rid of them, you'd have had to destroy the mattress and burn the sheets. We didn't have the authority to do that; so we put clean sheets on top of the bedbugs and at that point, it was up to the sanitation department and the public health nurse."

Says another of this crop of trainees, 20-year-old Marliou Hunt of Lehman, Pa., "I had never seen a slum until I came to Baltimore. The first time I walked in that kind of neighborhood, I got called nasty names, and it really shocked me."

The problem of developing meaningful communication with the poor struck home to a number of the trainees. Eric Metzner, 24, of Tucson, did his field work in a Negro boys' club. "There was a tremendous problem in trying to talk to the boys on a level of other than 'Let's play Ping-pong,'" Mr. Metzner says. "They were all colored kids—and you're white. So they assume you're a social worker; and why talk to a social worker?"

THEY WERE WORLDS APART

Twenty-year-old Henry Garland of Bergenfield, N.J., who developed a tutoring program at the same boys' club, reported a similar experience. "The kids were very reluctant to talk to a white person," Mr. Garland says. "It was their world and our world; they had a way of communicating among themselves that set them apart. Many of them had a sense of being satisfied with what they had; they knew they would grow up to be the useless black males you'd see around that area, and that was that."

But with a few of the youngsters, Mr. Garland was able to make real headway as a tutor. And this gives him hope. "If you can establish ties like that in only 6 weeks, in the year we're going to be working, well, poverty won't be unheard of after the year," he says, "but some few people might have been helped."

GETTING NEW PERSPECTIVES

Preconceptions about the poor were altered for many of the trainees by the 6-week course. Says David Meador, 21, of San Antonio, who joined VISTA after 2 years of college:

"I had read all these books, and I thought I had these people pegged. But I found the people I met to be intelligent and sensitive to a tremendous degree, to have great concern for their families, and to want to better themselves—characteristics which I didn't expect to find. There were those who were unintelligent and lazy, but not to the degree I anticipated. Many were people who really wanted to do something for themselves and their kids, and were just not able to do it."

Aids 19-year-old Marilyn Watts of Denver, a former Colorado University freshman, "I doubt very much that I'll ever be able to go back and think like my friends again."

The trainees had indeed changed over the 6-week period. And, if most of them would carry little in the way of skills or work experience to their VISTA assignments, they might well make up for that deficiency in the enthusiasm and dedication of youth.

In his final talk to them, the day before they left for their permanent VISTA assignments in the field, Mr. Kahn warned them not to expect Utopia: "All kinds of things can happen. Don't expect the fire department band to be on hand, and everything laid out for you when you arrive."

JAMES R. CONANT.

[From the National Observer, Aug. 16, 1965]
HOW PROJECT HEAD START IS WORKING: YELL COUNTY GETS A HANDLE ON POVERTY PROBLEM

OTIA, ARK.—Cindy is a 5-year-old girl with delicate features and flowing black hair who

had never seen an elephant. But last month she and her 39 classmates at a local school in Yell County here boarded a bus, clutching their picnic lunches, and drove to Little Rock, 90 miles to the east. There, at the zoo, she saw an elephant. "It had a long nose," she exclaimed last week. "It was bigger than a turtle. Bigger than my daddy." Now she draws pictures of elephants in watercolors, and pictures of herself, which show a girl with spindly legs, a round stomach, and a grin on her face.

Cindy doesn't know it, but the trip to the zoo, the watercolors, the songs she's taught to sing, the nourishing lunch she's served in school, the games she's taught to play—even the contests to see who can wash his hands the cleanest—all are designed to prepare her for entering first grade next month. For Cindy is one of those 500,000 children who are enrolled in the Federal antipoverty program's Project Head Start, the program aimed at bringing youngsters from what sociologists call "culturally deprived" homes closer to the level of the classmates they will soon meet. The program originally was planned as an 8-week summer project, but the response has been so good, said Federal Antipoverty Director R. Sargent Shriver last week, that the Government will make Head Start a year-round project.

Rural Yell County, where a steadily declining population (now 12,000) exists on an average family income of \$2,600 a year, is a good place to see Project Head Start in operation. It is a county where girls and boys from homes like Cindy's have traditionally quit school long before graduation. There are as many adults here with less than an eighth-grade education as there are with more.

SCANT SCHOOLING IS NO BAR

One reason for the high dropout rate is that a limited education has never served as much of a handicap. Yell County residents could make a living on family farms growing row crops like corn and cotton, or find employment in one of the sawmills and woodpulp factories that process timber from the area's deep forests.

But things are changing, here as in other rural areas. Increasingly, larger farms are squeezing out the small producer, and cutbacks in the timber industry have idled many. To provide steady employment and curb the steady population loss to the cities (15 percent since 1950), county leaders are seeking to attract new industry and develop the area's lakes and woods for recreation. Industry's demands for a skilled labor supply have spurred the county to establish an antipoverty program, with the emphasis on education. Project Head Start is part of the effort.

Explains Mrs. Hazel Marcum, a fourth grade teacher, who directs the local Head Start project: "A lot of kids show up for the first day of school showing serious effects from neglect. They don't have shoes, or they're not clean. Some from large families can't say more than a few words. They can't keep up in class, and they're laughed at. It doesn't take long before they lose interest."

WHAT THE CHILDREN ARE TAUGHT

To prevent this year's crop of first graders from being laughed at, the Federal Government is pouring \$84 million in antipoverty funds into Head Start projects in 2,300 communities. Yell County's program cost \$49,000, 90 percent of it to be paid by the Federal Government. The county will pay the rest. At half-day sessions in the county's 7 schools, 233 pupils learn to recognize colors and shapes, to use scissors, listen to music, recite nursery rhymes, and identify simple household objects like a toothbrush and a bar of soap.

I submit the results of the Harris survey as they appeared in the Washington Post, Thursday, September 23, 1965, and commend them to the attention of our colleagues.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 23, 1965]
AMERICANS FAVOR HOME RULE FOR WASHINGTON BY 6 TO 1

(By Louis Harris)

By better than 6 to 1, Americans support home rule for the city of Washington. Sizeable majorities of voters in all parties, people who voted for Goldwater or for Johnson in 1964, people from all regions, voters from big cities and small towns all favor home rule for residents of Washington.

The main reasons people give for backing home rule are three: that people in any area should have the right to govern themselves, that a city should determine its own destiny, and that Congress has not done a good job in running the city of Washington.

The opposition centers on one major concern over home rule—that with its large Negro population, a newly elected local District government would be dominated by that minority group.

A special cross section of the national electorate was reminded that Congress is soon going to vote on whether to give Washington home rule. Each person interviewed was then asked, "Would you favor or oppose home rule for Washington, D.C.?"

A total of 86 percent of the Nation's voters said they favor home rule, 10 percent said they oppose it and 24 percent said they were not sure how they felt about the issue.

Sentiment in favor of home rule for the city of Washington tends to run higher among the more affluent sectors of the population—those who have attended college and those earning over \$10,000 a year. Negroes also are overwhelmingly in favor of establishing local elective government in the Nation's Capital.

Support for home rule clearly is not a partisan political issue among the people, as evidenced by the fact that 1964 Goldwater and Johnson voters are almost equally in favor of passage of a home rule bill.

While support of home rule is highest in the West and Midwest, the ratio of backing is generally uniform across the Nation. The 6-to-1 majorities remain intact in the big cities, suburbs, small towns, and farms of the country.

Voters were probed in depth for what lay behind their stated views.

Typical of the comments volunteered in favor of home rule was that of a 68-year-old retired man in Los Angeles who said, "They are people like us and should have their own officials and their own government. Why should they be an exception?" A 40-year-old housewife in Stroud, Okla., added, "They have a right to their own government. America stands for what is right for one is right for all." A 39-year-old executive from Ann Arbor, Mich., said, "Congress has neither the time nor inclination to deal with the city's problems."

Opposing home rule was the wife of the store manager in Lancaster, N.Y., who said, "Because of the racial imbalance, every city office will be held by a Negro." A 31-year-old Okron, Ohio, rubber worker added, "The colored would just take over."

While the issue of home rule has stirred a division of opinion generating considerable heat, when all of the opinions are added, the prevailing view is a landslide in favor of home rule for the Capital City.

A cross section of Americans was asked: "As you know, the city of Washington, D.C., can vote in presidential elections, but does not elect its own city government. Congress is soon going to vote on whether or not to give the city of Washington home rule. Would you favor or oppose home rule for Washington, D.C.?"

Home rule for District of Columbia

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure
Nationwide.....	86	10	24
By political party:			
Republicans.....	56	11	23
Democrats.....	67	8	25
Independents.....	74	14	12
By region:			
East.....	50	8	42
Midwest.....	72	10	18
South.....	69	10	21
West.....	72	10	18
By size of place:			
City.....	66	11	23
Suburbs.....	63	5	32
Towns.....	67	11	22
Rural.....	66	12	22
By 1964 vote:			
Goldwater voters.....	63	14	23
Johnson voters.....	68	7	25
By education:			
8th grade or less.....	56	9	35
High school.....	67	8	25
College.....	69	15	16
By race:			
White.....	63	12	25
Negro.....	82	5	13
By religion:			
Protestant.....	73	9	18
Catholic.....	55	9	36
Jewish.....	63	11	26
By income:			
Under \$5,000.....	64	12	24
\$5,000 to \$9,999.....	65	7	28
Over \$10,000.....	72	15	13

Each voter who said he either favored or opposed home rule for Washington was asked:

"Why do you feel that way? Any other reason?"

Reasons favor or oppose home rule

	Total Nation	Republicans	Democrats	Independent
Why favor:				
Every city should determine own destiny.....	33	28	33	38
Every community has right to self-government.....	24	19	28	20
Can do better job than Congress.....	9	9	6	16
Total favoring.....	66	56	76	74
Why oppose:				
Too many Negroes, would take over.....	7	8	6	8
Seat of Federal Government should be run by Federal Government.....	2	1	1	6
Population is transient.....	1	2	1	0
Total opposing.....	10	11	8	14
Total not sure.....	24	33	25	12

Proposed Wage-Hour Bill Undermining Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Pekin, Ill., downtown businessmen got together and passed a resolution indicating their strong feelings on H.R. 10518. It is obvious these men and women feel the bill embodies simon-pure inflation and the payment of money not justified for the services rendered. The two aforementioned economic evils can kill a small

businessman quicker than anything. Needless to say, many of the Pekin downtown group are small businessmen.

Under unanimous consent, I include the resolution at this point:

RESOLUTION BY THE PEKIN DOWNTOWN BUSINESSMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Whereas wages is a problem between employer and employee, based on type of business and location, and therefore impossible and impractical to legislate; and

Whereas the proposed increase in the Federal minimum wage will work a hardship on small business whether it is or is not covered by H.R. 10518; and

Whereas necessitated increases to retain present personnel in the face of competition for employees and the resultant wage differentials; and

Whereas the decrease in the margin of profit which is already in a dangerous position; and

Whereas the increase of wage cost will necessarily be passed on to the consumer in higher prices; and

Whereas passage of the bill will, of necessity, eliminate jobs for the teenager and the unskilled; and

Whereas millions of second wage earners in a household with no skills and a willingness to work, will no longer have employment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Pekin Downtown Businessmen's Association, That all legislators carefully study the results of such legislation in the light of employment and taxes derived from business and individual profit; and be it further

Resolved, That the Downtown Businessmen's Association, realizing the costly consequences of an increase in the minimum wage law, strongly recommends the defeat of H.R. 10518; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our Representatives in Congress. Adopted in Pekin, Ill., this 13th day of September, A.D. 1965.

RUSSELL STRAUMANN,
Chairman.

A Question of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the ruthlessness with which the majority party has steamrollered through the Congress legislation demanded by the President has brought the charge from many quarters that the 89th Congress is a rubberstamp body doing the bidding of the President without adequate deliberation and the honest consideration of diverse views. There is no denying that there is substance to this charge. An editorial which appeared in the September 22, 1965, issue of the Chicago American discusses an example of the abuse of the legislative process and points out the danger to representative government in the application of such tactics.

The editorial follows:

A QUESTION OF POWER

The congressional debate over doing away with right-to-work laws is a debate by courtesy only. Normally the word means an exchange of differing viewpoints in an effort to settle an issue, or at least to clarify it,

A5456

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 27, 1965

but very little of that has been going on in Washington. The decisive question is how much steam there is in the Democratic steamroller.

President Johnson and the Democratic majority want to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law, which permits States to enact laws banning the union shop if they choose. A largely Republican minority led by Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, wants 14(b) maintained, and is planning a filibuster to prevent its removal. The whole issue apparently is to be settled by a test of lung power versus sheer weight of numbers.

And that prospect is not encouraging. To our mind, the central issue here is not whether 14(b) is repealed, but whether this same method of indifferently squashing opposition is to become normal procedure with the Federal Government. If the congressional majority flattens its opposition, the Justice Department will then roll over the 19 States that now have right-to-work laws; and in neither case will a question have been settled on its merits, but only by exercise of power.

We do not think right-to-work laws are an unmixed blessing, and we certainly would not like to see Illinois adopt one. What they generally confer is the right to work cheap. It can even be argued that the States that have these laws are following a short-sighted policy. They can boast an immediate advantage, in that the relatively low wage scales in these States tend to attract more industries; but once the industries have been attracted, the lower wages and consequently smaller buying power works against them.

The point is that the question of enacting these laws is one for individual States to decide. The value of laws against the union shop depends on a State's own circumstances, and should be judged by the State's voters. This exemplifies what the late Justice Frankfurter meant with his remark that the States serve as "laboratories for social experiment." There is no guarantee that an experiment will work, but the right to try it must be protected.

For the Federal Government to tell States that they may not have such laws is a frightening intrusion of Federal power into a State matter. And this time, there would be no question of Washington moving perforce into a vacuum left by a State's unwillingness to act.

The Johnson administration would be frankly using its power over Congress to flatten State opposition. It would be operating under a new and dangerous rule of thumb: If a State government doesn't share the official Federal view, that proves it isn't competent to enact its own laws.

And once that philosophy gains ground, State governments will be little more than lower echelon desks in a Federal bureaucracy.

The Situation in the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an editorial appearing in the Herald-American newspapers, Los Angeles, Calif., published by Mr. Cliff Smith.

I cannot conceive of how the State Department can continue on its piece-

meal surrender to communism throughout the world without a violent protest on the part of the American people. America seems to be like a person on the operating table, completely under anesthetics which have been applied in large doses by the administration. A thorough revamping of our State Department is long overdue, and, as George Washington said, "Put only Americans on guard tonight."

The editorial follows:

RUSK REPEATS HIS MISTAKES IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

The Dominican situation is deteriorating like everything else deteriorates that our secretary of State Rusk has anything to do with. He has a 25-year record of either deliberately messing up everything or making the wrong guess. It started when he gave the go ahead to the Chinese Communists as being nothing but simple agrarians seeking justice.

The Dominican Republic had a record of nothing but strife except during the time that the Dictator Trujillo was in charge. After he was murdered there was nothing but trouble, then a President named Juan Bosch was elected. He had strong leftwing tendencies and pulled into the Government numerous Communist sympathizers.

The rightwing party, which included the army and the air service in the Dominican Republic, executed a coup and forced Bosch to flee the country. They appointed a provisional government. The friends of Bosch then staged a counterrevolution and as the fighting became more and more pronounced, the counterrevolutionists welcomed more and more Communists and Communist sympathizers.

One of those reportedly killed on their side was Che Guevara, who for a number of years was Castro's right-hand man and a more radical Communist than Castro. There were 57 other pro-Communists in the high command of the rebel army according to the CIA.

Now the new deal has been set up by the Organization of American States with the consent and assistance of the U.S. State Department. They have picked a president, now in office, who was one of the assistants of Bosch when Bosch was President.

The next headline we find is that General Wessin y Wessin, brigadier general in command of the Dominican Air Corps was arrested and at bayonet point was put on a plane bound for Miami. He was appointed Dominican consul general to that city after he was deported but has refused the appointment.

Wessin y Wessin was not only a capable officer, he was a friend of the United States and completely free of Communist influences.

The same thing has now happened to him that has happened to many of the other friends of the United States in the various parts of the world. We have turned on our friends and backed such people as Castro in Cuba. The so-called dictator, Batista, that we threw out of Cuba, was a real friend of the United States. Our State Department insisted that Castro was the man we wanted to govern Cuba. They neglected to tell the people that he was a graduate of a Communist school. Everyone knows what happened after he took command in Cuba.

We forced the Indies chief, Sukarno, on the Dutch, and assisted him to take command of Indonesia.

The State Department handpicked Nasser to be the head man in Egypt. The State Department forced England, France, and Israel to pull back their armies when they were within 24 hours of capturing Cairo and Nasser.

Ayub Khan of Pakistan was our hand-picked little boy and we spent a number of billion dollars on him and the next thing

he did was get mad at us and throw in his lot with Red China.

There are many other instances of the United States throwing its weight behind men who became our drastic enemies shortly afterward.

When, oh, when are we going to clean out the State Department and get rid of the men who always pick the wrong horse.

L.B.J.'s Federnales Press Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about L.B.J.'s Federnales Press Service but two of the best articles I have read appeared in the San Francisco Sunday Examiner & Chronicle of September 26. The first article is by Douglas Kiker, correspondent from Washington, and the second is an article by Art Hoppe on the same subject. Both of these articles follow:

[From the San Francisco Sunday Examiner & Chronicle, Sept. 26, 1965]

L.B.J.'s FEDERNALES PRESS SERVICE: HE WANTS GOOD NEWS

(By Douglas Kiker)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson told a gathering of Government information officers last month that he expects them to spend more time producing favorable news about his administration and less time cooperating with reporters in search of stories which displease him.

The 62-minute meeting was held in the Fish Room at the White House on August 27 and the President delayed three appointments while he delivered his lecture.

At one point, sources said recently, he referred to a recent story which had angered him and pointed out that the reporter could not have gotten the facts without the cooperation of some of the men present in the room.

He then warned the group that if they could not produce the sort of good news he wanted, he would hire some high school seniors from Johnson City, Tex. and count on them to do the job.

At the same meeting, Presidential Press Secretary Bill Moyers told the group that the White House expects to have first choice on all the favorable news from all Federal agencies and departments.

Sources said that Johnson himself gave some specific examples of the sort of thing he had in mind. For example, he said, the Agriculture Department recently installed a new calculating machine which was serving to increase departmental efficiency. News of this should have been released by the White House, he maintained.

As a result of the meeting, the public relations men in the administration have been working overtime to supply the White House with the sort of news releases they want.

On September 6, for example, during a weekend in Austin, the White House released 42 stories, which ranged from the increase in national park visitors to the increase in homes for Indians financed by the Public Housing Administration.

White House reporters junked most of the releases, and joked about them to the extent that Moyers now reportedly has decided that the project was overdone and needs curtailing somewhat.